

Application No. 09/846,654

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Trinh et al. (hereinafter "Trinh"), WO 97/34987 in view of Painter et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,763,378 (hereinafter "Painter"). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to incorporate the blooming perfumes of Trinh with the particulate size range of the peroxide compositions of Painter. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

According to MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). "The mere fact that a worker in the art could rearrange the parts of the reference device to meet the terms of the claims...is not, by itself, sufficient to support a finding of obviousness. The prior art must provide a motivation or reason for the worker in the art, without the benefit of the [Applicant's] specification, to make the necessary changes in the reference device." *Ex parte Chicago Rawhide Manufacturing Co.*, 226 USPQ 438 (PTO Bd. App. 1984).

The Examiner's attention is drawn to the fact that though Painter discloses a broad diacyl peroxide particle size range of from 1 to 300 microns and a preferred diacyl peroxide particle size range of from 10 to 100 microns, the only examples provided in Painter disclose diacyl peroxide particle sizes in the range from 53 to 68 microns. It is submitted that the references do not provide "sufficient specificity" in their broad disclosure to constitute anticipation nor obviousness of the present invention even though a portion of the Applicant's claimed range of from about 0.1 to about 10 microns was partially disclosed by the references' broad range (e.g. 1 to 300 microns or 1 to 150 microns) since Painter's working examples fall within Painter's preferred range of from 10 to 100 microns.

When it is unclear whether a reference teaches the range with "sufficient specificity," the Examiner must provide reasons for anticipation as well, as a motivational statement regarding obviousness. *Ex parte Lee*, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993)(expanded Board). Here the Office Action does not discuss motivation regarding the issue of obviousness. It should be noted, however that neither Painter nor Trinh provide motivation to use diacyl peroxide particles in the Applicants' claimed range of from about 0.1 to about 10 microns. On the contrary, Painter does disclose a preference for particle sizes of 10 microns to 100 microns. This is manifested by the fact that the only examples provided in Painter disclose diacyl peroxide particle sizes in the range from 53 to 68 microns. More importantly, there is also no motivational

Application No. 09/846,654

statement made in Painter to use diacyl peroxide particles wherein at least about 25% of the particles are smaller than 1 micron.

Thus, while the broad teachings of the Painter patent do slightly overlap Applicant's claimed range, the obviousness rejection fails since neither Painter nor Trinh provide motivation to use diacyl peroxide particles wherein at least about 25% of the particles are smaller than 1 micron. Therefore, the Applicants' invention is clearly outside the combined teachings of the cited references, and as such would not support an obviousness rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place the present claims in condition for allowance. WHEREFORE, entry of the amendments provided herewith, reconsideration of the claims as amended in light of the remarks provided, withdrawal of the claims rejections, and allowance of Claims 1-20, as amended, are respectfully requested. In the event that issues remain prior to allowance of the noted claims, then the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's undersigned Attorney to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

For: Jonathan Richard Clare

By

Kevin L. Waugh
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,206
Tele. No.: (513) 627-7386

June 25, 2003
Customer No. 27752

FAX RECEIVED
JUN 26 2003
GROUP 1700

Application No. 09/846,634

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADEIN THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 14 and 15 have been amended.

1. (Twice Amended) An automatic dishwashing detergent composition comprising, by weight:
 - (a) from about 0.01% to about 5% of a blooming perfume composition comprising from about 15% to about 60% of blooming perfume ingredients having a boiling point of less than about 260°C and a ClogP of at least about 3, and from about 15% to about 70% of delayed blooming perfume ingredients having a boiling point of less than about 260°C and a ClogP of less than about 3, wherein the weight ratio of blooming perfume ingredients to delayed blooming perfume ingredients is from about 0.25 to about 1.5 and said blooming perfume composition comprises at least about 40% by weight of blooming perfume ingredients and delayed blooming perfume ingredients, and
 - (b) an effective amount of a diacyl peroxide bleaching agent having a particle size of from about 0.1 to about 10 microns wherein at least about 25% of the particles are smaller than [6] μ micron[s].
14. (Twice Amended) The composition according to Claim 1 wherein at least about 50% of the particles are smaller than [6] μ micron[s].
15. (Twice Amended) The composition according to Claim 14 wherein at least about 75% of the particles are smaller than [6] μ micron[s].